3

•,

Amendment and Transmittal of Sworn

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 6-8 and 12-14 have only

been objected to as being dependent upon rejected claims, and have been deemed to present

allowable subject matter. Claims 1-5 and 9-11 have been rejected. The Abstract and claims 10

and 11 have been amended. Claims 1 and 9 are independent.

The claim revisions made herein merely improve the syntax of the claims and

clearly do not narrow the scope or spirit of the claims. In accordance with Festo Corp. v.

Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd., 535 U.S. 722, 727 (2002), this Amendment

does not alter the available scope or range of equivalents for the claims, either literally or under

the doctrine of equivalents.

Various claim changes are stylistic in nature, and just improve the form and

clarity of the claims. No new matter has been added; the changes to claim 1 involving

transmission of external force through part of the ink jet printer when the ink cartridge is

mounted on the ink jet printer are fully supported by the original disclosure, for example, in

Figs. 4, 7 and 8.

The Objection

to the Abstract

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to because of the use of the term

"comprises". The Examiner helpfully suggested that term be changed to --includes--.

The Abstract has been revised in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, this objection has been overcome. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of

this objection are respectfully requested.

Page 7 of 9

U.S. Patent Appln. 10/642,884
Amendment and Transmittal of Sworn
Translations filed February 9, 2005
Response to Office Action mailed December 1, 2004

The Objection to the Claims

į.

۲

Claims 10 and 11 were objected to on grounds the syntax of the claims required

correction.

Claims 10 and 11 have been revised to attend to the points noted by the

Examiner. Accordingly, this objection has been overcome. Favorable reconsideration and

withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 and 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent Appln. Publn. No. 2004/0155913 to Kosugi et al. Applicants

respectfully traverse this rejection, and submit the following arguments in support thereof.

This rejection is not well-taken, because Kosugi is not prior art as to the present

invention. Specifically, this application claims the priority of two Japanese patent applications

respectively filed on August 22, 2002, and April 14, 2003. The invention, as claimed, is

supported by these Japanese applications.

Kosugi was filed on August 8, 2003, after both of these priority dates.

Accordingly, Kosugi is not prior art as to the present invention.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.55(a)(4), English translations of the two

priority documents for this application are submitted herewith. Each translation includes a

statement of accuracy.

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully

requested.

Page 8 of 9

U.S. Patent Appln. 10/642,884
Amendment and Transmittal of Sworn
Translations filed February 9, 2005
Response to Office Action mailed December 1, 2004

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, favorable consideration and prompt allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

In the event that there are any questions, or should additional information be required, please contact Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Schaeffer Registration No. 32,716

Attorney for Applicants

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN

LLP

180 Maiden Lane

New York, New York 10038-4982

(212) 806-5400